

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in response to the Office action mailed June 14, 2006. Applicant has amended claims 1-3 and 7, and canceled claims 4 and 10 without prejudice. Claims 1-3 and 5-9 are pending in the application.

Applicant appreciates Examiner's thorough search and careful consideration of the present application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 7, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zinda (US Pub. No. 2004/0015481), hereinafter referred to as Zinda.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 3-6, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zinda in view of Lee, US Pub. No. 2005/0119995 (hereinafter referred to as Lee).

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejected claims are now patentable, as follows:

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

"a parameter obtaining module for obtaining data input by a user, the data comprising downloading parameters and data on a patent classification, the patent classification comprising any one or more of the international patent classification, the United States of America patent classification, and a user defined patent classification."

As indicated on page 3 of the Office action, Zinda fails to disclose or teach data on a patent classification mode, a time mode, and a time range as

originally recited in claim 3. Applicant has amended claim 1 by incorporating the substance of the patent classification mode limitation of claim 3 therein. Therefore, applicant submits that amended claim 1 is novel 35 under U.S.C. §102(e) over Zinda.

As indicated on page 4 of the Office action, Lee teaches the patent classification being the international patent classification, the United States of America patent classification, or a user defined patent classification (para. [0019]). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Lee discloses in para. [0019] that a search engine 304 performs searches based on input data such as: identification numbers (e.g., patent number); keywords; text or graphics in select fields (e.g., different segments or information fields of documents such as Publication Number, Publication Date, Title, Inventor, Assignee, Application Number, Filing Date, Related Data, Priority Data, International Classification, U.S. Classification, Cross-Reference Classification, Field of Search, References Cited, Forward References Citing Document, Examiner, Agent, Abstract, Background, Field of Invention, Summary, Brief Description of Drawings, Detailed Description, Claims, Drawings, etc.); Boolean logic characters, or other search criteria (e.g., date restrictions, etc.). However, Lee does not provide any teaching or suggestion of the claimed "patent classification" comprising *a user defined patent classification*. Accordingly, Lee does not disclose, teach or suggest the limitation of "a parameter obtaining module for obtaining data input by a user, the data comprising downloading parameters and data on a patent classification, the patent classification being the international patent classification, the United States of America patent classification, or *a user defined patent classification*."

Furthermore, applicant submits that the combination of Zinda and Lee fails to disclose, teach, or otherwise suggest the invention having the above-described limitations as currently set forth in claim 1 as amended.

Neither Zinda nor Lee provides any teaching, suggestion, or motivation that it could be combined with the other to yield the inventive system as currently set forth in claim 1, as amended. That is, amended claim 1 is unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Zinda in view of Lee.

In conclusion, amended claim 1 is not only novel under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Zinda, but also unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Zinda in view of Lee. Therefore, applicant requests reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

Claims 2-3 and 5-6 depend directly or indirectly from independent amended claim 1, and respectively recite additional subject matter. Therefore, claims 2-3 and 5-6 are also allowable.

Because claim 4 has been canceled without prejudice, the rejection relating thereto is now moot.

Claim 7, as amended, recites in part:

"obtaining attribute data on analyzing the data stored in the local database server, the attribute data comprising a classification mode, the classification mode comprising any one or more of the international patent classification, the United States of America patent classification, and *a user defined patent classification.*"

For at least reasons similar and corresponding to those asserted above in relation to amended claim 1, applicant submits that neither Zinda nor Lee, taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or otherwise suggests the invention having the above-described limitation, as currently set forth in amended claim 7.

Accordingly, amended claim 7 is not only novel under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Zinda, but also unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Zinda in view of Lee. Therefore, applicant requests reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

Claims 8-9 depend directly from independent claim 7, and respectively recite additional subject matter. Therefore, claims 8-9 are also allowable.

Because claim 10 has been canceled without prejudice, the rejection relating thereto is now moot.

In view of the above claim amendments and remarks, the subject application is believed to be in a condition for allowance, and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Lee et al.

By 

Wei Te Chung

Registration No.: 43,325

Foxconn International, Inc.

P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel. No.: (408) 919-6137